





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/538,380	03/29/2000	Jennie Ching	1503P/BC999068	6677
7590 01/12/2004			EXAMINER	
Sawyer Law Group LLP			ALI, SYED J	
P O Box 51418 Palo Alto, CA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	
			DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/538,380	CHING ET AL.				
\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Syed J Ali	2127				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	evoid abandonment of this application 1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in	า			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the san SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dather been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mote armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the distatutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension feether the final Office action; or (2) as set	e under t forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	ecause:					
(a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplify	ing the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amen	dment			
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does NOT plac	e the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newl	ly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:					
Claim(s) allowed: NONE						
Claim(s) objected to: WVF						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-10 and 12-21</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other: MENG-AL TAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER						
	SUPERVISO TECHNO	RY PATENT EXAMINER LOGY CENTER 2100				



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that there would be no reason to use the server management thread of Sharma in connection with the scheduling mechanisms of Sequeira, since Sequeira discloses management of threads without using a main manager thread. However, simply because Sequeira discloses a method of managing creation and deletion of threads in a thread pool without using a main manager thread does not preclude that a benefit could be gained from using a management thread. Specifically, functionality could be defined within the management thread that controls the creation and deletion of worker threads in response to various conditions. Additionally, not only would the management thread control the creation and deletion of worker threads, but the main management thread also would serve as a communication point for all service requests. Further, Applicant argues that the System Scheduling Mechanism of Sequeira is not shown to be part of an operating system. However, the scheduling of tasks, processes, and/or threads within a computing system is controlled by the operating system. That is, the operating system controls the scheduling of CPU time, thus the Scheduling Mechanism would inherently be a part of the operating system. Additionally, Applicant argues that the disclosure of a PSSP layer over an AIX operating system layer would not suggest a task manager in that layer. However, these programming interfaces are to be a part of the operating system. Wang discloses a method of designing a physical layout for a database system, but does not account for scheduling the CPU resources for the system. Thus, a need exists to schedule the tasks, processes, and/or threads associated with those programming interfaces.